1	Sheri M. Thome, Esq.	
2	Nevada Bar No. 008657 Nicholas F. Adams, Esq.	
3	Nevada Bar No. 014813 WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ,	
	EDELMAN & DICKER LLP 6689 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 200 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119	
4		
5	Telephone: 702.727.1400 Facsimile: 702.727.1401	
6	Email: Sheri.Thome@wilsonelser.com Email: Nicholas.Adams@wilsonelser.com	
7	Attorneys for Defendants	
8	Sandy Van, Sandy Van, LLC dba Van Law Firm, and Van and Associates Law Firm, PLLC	
9		
	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
11	JOCELYNE R. UY, an individual; and	Case No. 2:24-cv-00599-JCM-DJA
12	WESTLEY U. VILLANUEVA, an individual,	
13	Plaintiffs,	STIPULATION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF
14	v.	TIME TO RESPOND TO FIRST
15	SANDY VAN, an individual; NGAN VAN LE,	AMENDED COMPLAINT AND ORDER (Second Request)
16	an individual; SANDY VAN, LLC dba VAN LAW FIRM, a Nevada Domestic Limited-	_
17	Liability Company; VAN AND ASSOCIATES	
	LAW FIRM, PLLC, a Nevada Professional Limited Liability Company; JML HOLDINGS,	
18	LLC, a Nevada Domestic Limited-Liability Company; NGAN VAN LE as Trustee for the	
19	AD VITAM AUT CULPAM TRUST; JML SURGICAL CENTER, LLC, a Nevada	
20	Domestic Limited-Liability Company; DOES I	
21	through X; and ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, inclusive,	
22	Defendants.	
23		
	Defendants, Sandy Van, Sandy Van, LLC dba Van Law Firm, Van and Associates Law	
24	Firm, PLLC (the "Sandy Van Defendants"), Ngan Van Le, JML Holdings, LLC, Ad Vitam Aut	
25	Culpam Trust, and JML Surgical Center, LLC (the "Van Le Defendants") (collectively	
26	"Defendants"), by and through their respective counsel of record, and Plaintiffs, Jocelyne R. Uy and	
27		
28	Westley U. Villanueva (collectively "Plaintiffs"), by and through their counsel of record, hereby	
	stipulate and agree as follows:	

295284609v.1

This is the second stipulation to extend the time for Defendants to respond to Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint. A previous stipulation was submitted on April 4, 2024 [ECF No. 4], and was denied without prejudice [ECF No. 5].

Following the notice of removal filed by the Sandy Van Defendants, all Defendants had until April 3, 2024, to respond to Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 81(c)(2)(C). On April 2, 2024, as a matter of professional courtesy, Plaintiffs granted Defendants up to and including April 17, 2024 to respond to their First Amended Complaint.

Good cause exists to extend the deadline for Defendants to respond to the First Amended Complaint. Prior to removal to this Court, the deadline for the Sandy Van Defendants to respond to the First Amended Complaint did not coincide with the Van Le Defendants' deadline. The best interests of the parties were served, and judicial economy was improved, by having all Defendants respond to the First Amended Complaint on the same day. Furthermore, removal shortened the time for the Van Le Defendants relative to their deadline prior to removal. Lastly, counsel for Defendants has conflicting time-sensitive firm deadlines in other matters, such as responding to written discovery and preparing supplemental disclosures, reviewing and responding to other complaints, and working on and responding to summary judgment motions. The granting of additional time helps counsel for Defendants better manage and prioritize their respective caseloads. Although Defendants' counsel have been diligent in evaluating Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, given the numerous causes of action asserted by Plaintiffs, including acts of alleged racketeering, additional time is needed for Defendants to fairly and adequately respond to the First Amended Complaint.

Excusable neglect also exists to permit the extension sought through this Stipulation even though it is requested after the deadline to respond to the First Amended Complaint has expired. As noted above, prior to expiration of the deadline, the parties submitted a stipulation extending the deadline. Due to oversight, counsel for Defendants failed to set forth the reasons (as noted herein) for the request for additional time to respond to the First Amended Complaint. The factors that courts consider in deciding whether neglect is excusable are thus met: (i) Plaintiffs, who have approved the extension, will not suffer prejudice if this request is granted: (ii) the delay in

1 responding to the First Amended Complaint is minimal (e.g., Defendants will respond to the First 2 Amended Complaint within three weeks of removal); (iii) Defendants did not delay in seeking the 3 extension prior to the initial deadline; and (iv) Defendants have acted in good faith. Counsel certifies that this request is made in good faith and not for the purposes of delay and 4 5 request that it be granted by the Court. DATED this day of 5th day of April, 2024 6 7 WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN 8 & DICKER LLP 9 BY: /s/ Nicholas F. Adams 10 Sheri M. Thome, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 008657 11 Nicholas F. Adams, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 014813 12 6689 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 200 13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119 Attorneys for Defendants 14 Sandy Van, Sandy Van, LLC dba Van Law Firm, and Van and Associates Law Firm, 15 PLLC DATED this day of 5th day of April, 2024 16 17 JEPSEN LAW, PLLC and ADLER & 18 VILLANUEVA, LLC 19 BY: /s/ Kendra Jepsen 20 Kendra Jepsen, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 014065 21 JEPSEN LAW, PLLC 405 March Avenue 22 Reno, Nevada 89509 23 Silvia U. Villanueva, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 013608 24 ADLER & VILLANUEVA, LLC 111 W. Telegraph Street, Ste. 200 25 Carson City, Nevada 89703 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Jocelyn R. Uy and 26 Westley U. Villanueva 27 28

DATED this day of 5th day of April, 2024 **BAILEY KENNEDY, LLP** BY: /s/ Joshua P. Gilmore Joshua P. Gilmore, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 11576 8984 Spanish Ridge Ave. Las Vegas, Nevada 89148 Attorneys for Defendants Ngan Van Le, JML Holdings, LLC, Ad Vitam Aut Culpam Trust, and JML Surgical Center, LLC **ORDER** IT IS SO ORDERED. day of April, 2024. DATED this __ UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE